Dear Sirs and Madams:

I am a Systems and Network Architect with a hardware company in
Marlboro, Massachusetts. I can implement as part of my company's
network and communications infrastructure any technology I wish. Or I
could if it were not for the presence of Microsoft on the scene.

I would choose, and do where it is possible to do so, to implement Open
Source software such as Apache webserver, RedHat Linux operating
systems, and many others. In some cases this has proved impossible
because of Microsoft's sheer overwhelming presence and effect on the
marketplace.

I recently purchased a Network Appliance File Server, a specialized
server for holding and providing large quantities of data to users.
After several months of attempting to make this product function without
resorting to a Microsoft Windows NT server for authentication, I was
finally forced to turn to this for two specific reasons. The first is
that Microsoft, to extend their control and reach, perverts and changes
and adds to existing interoperabe open sourced and publicly defined
protocols, making them no longer work except with Microsoft products.
In this case the Samba program, an open source alternative to an NT
server, communicates in this case differently than an NT server in an
obscure manner. Forcing Microsoft to cease to alter defined protocols
or to publish their specifications for any network communications would
allow competition that is not possible at present. Second, Microsoft's
threatening position in the marketplace causes companies such as Network
Appliance to heed what works with a Microsoft solution and effectively
ignore interoperability which signifigantly cripples software
development by fragmenting programs into those that adhere to the
Microsoft line and those who do not do so. While Network Appliance pays
lip service to interoperability, the actual performance is not present.
This wastes an amount of effort truly unimaginable. Microsoft can and
does incorporate new "features" all the time into its "operating
system". Many of these new features, beyond the browsers, represent
formerly independent companies who were forced to make a deal with
Microsoft to license or sell their technology, or are forced out of
business as Windows now contains that feature.

Much more importantly, having a single corporation guide all commercial
software development direction forces a single viewpoint on how humans
should interact with computers. This is flat wrong. The windows
interface (it is truly NOT an operating system as such, merely a way to
interact with hardware) is only one logic for dealing with data and a

very limited one. As these machines become more interleaved into our
culture, such a mono-theism is s serious mistake. Despite Microsoft's
claims to innovation, they on the contrary stifle and prevent an
extraordinary amount of development by their currentl monopoly.

The remedy proposed by the Department of Justice is very weak and not
really effective in curbing Microsoft in the market. This solution is
inadequate and should be rethought before this moves forward.

Sincerely,
Doug Munsinger

--

Doug Munsinger
egenera, Inc.
dmunsinger@egenera.com
508-858-2612 | Cell: 508-326-0872
165 Forest Street, Marlboro, MA 01752

Sarah: And finally, does your computer ever crash?
Bill: Oh definitely, believe me I get to the bottom of
it every time and that's part of the passion that I and
a lot of Microsoft people have is we want to make a tool
that we want to use ourselves and we know from our own use
we can make it a lot better and a lot more reliable.
--Interview 6 December 2001 with Bill Gates by BBC Children's TV

                    PING!
ICMP: the protocol that goes   ...